DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 715 EA 015 564

TITLE	Effective Schooling & Dissemination Processes Proceedings: Seminars on Dissemination Processes. (Chicago, IL, October 12-14, 1982).
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Dissemination Support Service.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 82
CONTRACT	400-80-0105
NOTE	79p.; Table I may not reproduce due to small, blurred print of original document.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agencies; Annotated Bibliographies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; *Regional Laboratories; *Research and Development Centers; *School Effectiveness; *Seminars; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Research and Development Exchange

ABSTRACT

This seminar marked the beginning of the formal sharing and analysis of National Institute of Education sponsored research and development in effective schooling and dissemination processes. All laboratories and centers were represented, and their materials were shared. The participants were those responsible for establishing and supporting the development of effective dissemination processes in state, intermediate, and local agencies. The seminar was composed of three phases: (1) profiling effective schooling resources, (2) analyzing effective dissemination strategies, and (3) identifying and analyzing key issues faced in delivering research and development resources. This report provides the schedule, summarizes the three phases, lists participants, and contains the seminar evaluation report. In the appendixes are guidelines for presenters and listeners, several forms for participants to use during the phases, and selected resources, some of which are annotated, relating to effective schooling processes submitted by the different research laboratories and exchanges. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Margaret Rogers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

proceedings

ED228715

SEMINARS ON DISSEMINATION PROCESSES

effective schooling & dissemination processes

Joseph T. Pascarelli, Director
Dissemination Support Service
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Contract No. 400-80-0105

Center for Continuing Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

October 12-14, 1982

EA 015 563

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-80-0105 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Program	5
Section I - Program Proceedings	11
Section II - List of Participants	27
Section III - Seminar Evaluation	33
Appendices:	
Appendix A - Guidelines for Presenters and Listeners	45
Appendix B - Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix	55
Appendix C - Resources I Need to Know More About	59
Appendix D - Selected Resources Relating to Effective Schooling Processes	63
Appendix E - Summary of Within School Factors Thought to Characterize the Instructionally Effective School	81
Appendix F - Effective Schooling: What Are Labs and Centers Developing? and Some Representative Resources Developed by Some Centers	85
Appendix G - Papers Prepared for the National Invitational Conference - Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice	93
Attachments:	
Attachment I - "Considering the Research: What Makes An Effective School?" by John Westbrook, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory	
Attachment II - "What's the Fit? Dissemination Processes and Effective Schooling" by Ann Murphy, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory	

INTRODUCTION

The emerging R&D knowledge base in Effective Schooling processes presents challenging opportunities to us. As members of the R&D community, we are being asked to move thoughtfully yet quickly to translate and adapt the knowledge base to operational processes. Again, we must diagnose carefully, reshape and match with as much precision as possible well-researched information to district and school-based needs.

We continue to question, to be selective, to make new connections, and to share and collaborate with colleagues and agencies across the country. But perhaps as we look to the body of information on Effective Schooling, it is with a rediscovered sense of excitement--schools can and do make a difference! We now have isolated some factors that influence learning. If we are willing to stay committed, to use our collective energies, and to share successes, we can realize the national impact for which our R&D network was designed.

This Seminar marks the beginning of the formal sharing and analysis of NIE-sponsored research and development in Effective Schooling and dissemination processes. All Labs and Centers were represented and materials shared. Through such a Seminar, it is our hope that the benefits of linkage and cooperation become more visible.

A seminar of this nature requires careful preplanning, collaborative support of participating agencies, and a willingness to share and be influenced by others. DSS staff involved all Regional Exchange units in early design work and in later developmental activities. Representatives of each Exchange were invited to identify and collect resources being used in field work and to be prepared to share and describe them

with others. In addition, Exchange staff were asked to analyze their dissemination strategies along with peers at the Seminar. A series of guidelines were developed for presenters and seminar participants that described roles and tasks. These are included in Appendix A of this product.

A pre-Seminar packet was distributed to all Seminar registrants that included the following:

- a detailed program (See Program Proceedings section)
- Guidelines for Listeners - to be used during Phase I (Appendix A)
- Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix - to be used during Phase I to track how Exchanges/Labs are operationalizing R&D resources on Effective Schooling (Appendix B)
- Resources I Need to Know More About - a tool to be used by participants to help them identify resources and names of contact persons they need to know more about. These were submitted to DSS staff to sort, classify and forward to the appropriate agencies for distribution of materials (Appendix C)
- Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School? - a knowledge synthesis, developed by John Westbrook of Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, to serve as a common basis for understanding Effective Schooling processes at the Seminar (See Attachment #1)
- What's the Fit? Dissemination Processes and Effective Schooling - a workbook document designed as a think piece for Seminar participants. Developed by the Dissemination Support Service, it includes selected quotations, models and excerpts intended to evoke reactions from participants experienced in dissemination processes
- Evaluation Form - See Evaluation section of this document

The reader needs to be made aware of the following:

- The primary audience of this Seminar are those responsible for establishing and supporting the development of effective dissemination processes in state, intermediate, and local state agencies.
- A seminar of this nature is intended as a growth opportunity for participants--an event that expands one's perspective and understanding of capacity-building processes.

- This Seminar is one of a series and readers are encouraged to "connect" it to earlier seminars and seminar reports that dealt with related areas such as: networking, interorganizational collaboration, the change process, designing training and school improvement.

- This Seminar was designed to examine two substantive areas of "content"--effective schooling R&D knowledge bases/practices and dissemination processes. Operationally, of course, both areas are well-integrated into Exchange service work. A seminar of this nature, however, provides participants with a unique opportunity to examine each as discrete pieces and then as components of effective delivery systems.

- The Seminar design is comprised of three phases:

  Phase I - Profiling Effective Schooling Resources

  Phase II - Analyzing Effective Dissemination Strategies

  Phase III - Identifying and Analyzing Key Issues Faced in Delivering Effective Schooling Resources to Clients

- The nature of the work of each Regional Exchange is unique to the contextual variables of the region it serves. Much of the work is diagnostic and only those resources needed are matched. This is important as one reads through the lists of resources developed/adapted by each Lab unit and the way in which the unit is addressing the effective schooling R&D base.

- Resources listed in Appendix D are selected and not intended to reflect a comprehensive reporting of all materials developed and/or in use.

- The three central support services of the Research and Development Exchange are Research and Development Interpretation Service (CEMREL), System Support Service (Far West Laboratory), and Resource and Referral Service (National Center for Research in Vocational Education). These three, along with Dissemination Support Service, play important roles in supporting the developmental work of the Regional Exchanges. Though not included in Appendix D as contributors, their systemic function is important to the effectiveness of the RDx.

Finally, special thanks to the following colleagues who made the national event "work":

Ruth Gordon, National Center for Research in Vocational Education

Dick Luther, Alaska State Department of Education

Alan Shark, National School Board Association

Phil Hawkins, Michigan State Department of Education

Olga Moir, Wayne County (Michigan) Intermediate S.A.

Clark Chipman, U.S. Department of Education

Dave Holdzkom, CEMREL, Inc.

Daryl Hahn, Maine State Department of Education

Nancy Baker-Jones, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Representatives from state agencies and local districts (who helped us with a reality check)

Michael Cohen, National Institute of Education

and Dave Clark, Dale Mann, and Shirley Hord.

———

Joseph T. Pascarelli, Ed.D.
December, 1982

DISSEMINATION PROCESSES SEMINAR VIII
OCTOBER 12-14, 1982 -- UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING AND DISSEMINATION PROCESSES

PROGRAM

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12
10:00AM--1:00PM

REGISTRATION -- SEE DIRECTORY IN HOTEL LOBBY FOR REGISTRATION LOCATION

1:00PM

WELCOME - DR. ETHEL SIMON-MCWILLIAMS, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY (NWREL)

SEMINAR OUTCOMES & OVERVIEW

CONVENER: JOE PASCARELLI, DIRECTOR, DISSEMINATION SUPPORT SERVICE, NWREL

1:30PM

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING: A VIEW FROM WITHIN - A SEMINAR STARTER

PHASE I. PROFILING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING RESOURCES

2:00PM

SHARING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT-BASED RESOURCES: BUILDING A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING RESOURCES - PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES

FACILITATOR: DAVID HOLDZKOM, DIRECTOR, RESOURCE & REFERRAL SERVICE, CEMREL, INC.

TUESDAY, October 12 (Continued)

3:45PM	EXAMINING WHAT REPRESENTED PROJECTS HAVE DEVELOPED/ADAPTED Individualized Analysis Sessions (Review of Materials)
4:45PM	ADJOURN FOR DINNER
7:00PM	INTERACTING: PRESENTERS/PARTICIPANTS EXAMINE RESOURCES ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING Small Group Sign-Up Sessions
9:30PM	ADJOURN

WEDNESDAY, October 13

8:30AM	REFOCUSING - Continued Interactions
10:00AM	PIECING TOGETHER THE FRAMEWORK A Summary
10:45AM	THE POLITICS AND ADMINISTERING OF INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS DALE MANN, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
11:30AM	EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING: WHAT ARE LABS AND CENTERS DEVELOPING? SHIRLEY HORD, RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (REPRESENTING CEDAR GROUP)
12:00 NOON	LUNCH

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13 (CONTINUED)

PHASE II. ANALYZING EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES

1:30PM — SHARING AND ANALYZING HOW WE'RE DELIVERING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT-BASED RESOURCES - PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES

FACILITATOR: PHIL HAWKINS, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, MICHIGAN STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

4:30PM — ADJOURN

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14

8:30AM — REFOCUSING - CONTINUED SHARING AND ANALYSIS OF DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES

10:00AM — REFLECTIONS ON DELIVERY SYSTEMS

DAVE CLARK, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

PHASE III. IDENTIFYING AND ANALYZING KEY ISSUES FACED IN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING RESOURCES TO CLIENTS

11:15AM — PANEL:

DOUG FLEMING, NORTHEAST REGIONAL EXCHANGE

RICHARD MCCANN, RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.

OLGA MOIR, CLIENT SERVICES COORDINATOR, PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE CENTER, WAYNE COUNTY ISD

TOM OLSON, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF PLANNING AND SERVICE COORDINATION, NWREL

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14 (CONTINUED)

12:15PM	LUNCH
1:30PM	TOWARD RESOLVING SOME ISSUES SMALL GROUP PROBLEM SOLVING
3:00PM	REPORTING OUT AND SYNTHESIS CAROL THOMAS, REGIONAL EXCHANGE, CEMREL, INC. DARYL HAHN, DIRECTOR, STATE CAPACITY PROJECT, MAINE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
3:30PM	CLOSING STATEMENTS
3:45PM	SEMINAR ADJOURNMENT

ADDITIONAL RESOURCE CONSULTANTS AND UNITS:

- DALE MANN
  PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN
  DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
  TEACHERS COLLEGE
  COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

- DAVE CLARK
  PROFESSOR
  SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
  INDIANA UNIVERSITY

- SHIRLEY HORD
  RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
  UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

- Michael Cohen
  NIE Senior Associate
  National Institute of Education
  Washington, D.C.

- Alan Shark
  Director of Development Services
  National School Boards Association
  Washington, D.C.

- Richard Luther
  Director
  Educational Program Support
  Alaska Department of Education

- The Regional Exchanges from:
  Appalachia Educational Laboratory
  CEMREL, Inc.
  Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory
  Northeast Regional Exchange
  Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
  Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
  SWRL Research and Development

- Central Support Services of the RDx:
  Resource & Referral Service
  R&D Interpretation Service
  System Support Service
  Dissemination Support Service

- Alaska Effective Schooling Project, Alaska Department of Education

- CEDaR Effective Schooling Resource Group

- National School Boards Association

SECTION I

WELCOME

Dr. Ethel Simon-McWilliams, Associate Director, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, welcomed participants to the Seminar. She acknowledged participants' roles during the past few years in contributing to the development of the national knowledge bases in Effective Schooling and in assisting in the building of state and regional dissemination capacities. The Seminar she viewed as a "golden opportunity for [participants] to begin to synergize [our] knowledge bases and to share strategies for utilizing systems in place for adapting such knowledge to school practitioners." She concluded her welcome by challenging the group to "think networking" and influence the development of environments in which students are afforded more effective schooling practices.

INTRODUCTIONS AND OVERVIEW

After identifying the regional and local groups represented, Dr. Joe Pascarelli, Director of Dissemination Support Service, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, identified the following purposes of the Seminar for participants:

> To gain a clearer focus concerning the implications of effective schooling research and resources.
>
> To share strategies for disseminating effective schooling research findings and resources.
>
> To identify and explore key issues faced by the RDx in delivering effective schooling resources and research findings to clients.

He stressed the participatory nature of the Seminar, especially the built-in expectations that attendees share and describe R&D resources developed and/or adapted. Further, it was anticipated that they

demonstrate commitment to building a larger resource base to include information on operational strategies used by labs and centers to move the R&D knowledge base closer to the practitioner level.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING: A VIEW FROM WITHIN

Pascarelli reminded the group that as they connect R&D resources on effective schooling to the school level, they view it as a change process and consider three fundamental points about educational change (Fullan, 1982):

- the primary purpose of the change process (e.g., effective schooling) is to help schools accomplish their goals more effectively
- change happens to individuals--and as it occurs from both external and internal sources, it is often characterized in terms of acceptance, rejection and modification
- educational change is context-bound and, as such, must be viewed in terms of the culture (e.g., socio-political climate) of each setting in which it is occurring

Additionally, he presented a list of ten cautions for participants to use as they explore effective schooling and dissemination processes:

1. Respect the uniqueness of each presenting unit's perspective. The variety of perspectives increases the richness of information shared.
2. Suspend one's judgment. Assume a detached stance, placing aside one's own biases and attitudes, and "tune in" to the presentor's experiences.
3. Enrich the group by being willing to share one's own knowledges and experiences.
4. Beware of the jargon and how it is used. Test for precise meanings--reduce to the simplest usage level when possible.
5. Examine the change effort being described in terms of it being voluntarily sought or externally imposed and the conditions that exist in either case.
6. View effective schooling processes as a means rather than an end. Ultimately, these processes must influence student achievement.

7. Push the information shared down from a level of abstraction to concrete terms. For example, how can a "climate of expectation" be reduced to overt, observable behaviors?

8. Be open to discovering new models--new configurations being described. Behave with the curiosity of an action researcher.

9. Effective Schooling R&D practices are not context free. They are inextricably part of the specific school culture being identified.

10. Beware of the gurus and how we, as members of the R&D community, shape their roles and determine their levels of influence as we work with them in communicating R&D information to clients.

At this point, Pascarelli invited participants to use an Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix as resources and strategies began to be described by each Regional Exchange and district represented. The matrix was designed as a tool to help participants match the R&D resources described to such Effective Schooling elements as: Leadership, Classroom Instruction and Management, School Environment, Curriculum, Assessment and Evaluation, etc. (See Appendix B - Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix.)

Pascarelli then described the three phases of the Seminar: Profiling Effective Schooling Resources, Analyzing Effective Dissemination Strategies, and Identifying and Analyzing Key Issues Faced in Delivering Effective Schooling Resources to Clients.

PHASE I: PROFILING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING RESOURCES

Tom Olson, Director of the Division of Planning and Service Coordination of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, introduced Phase I, asking participants to use the Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix as a listening tool and as presenters, to share their R&D resources to relate the information to appropriate category(ies) on their matrices.

Phase I was comprised of three modules. First, brief presentations were made by Regional Exchange staff to highlight those resources to be

shared and also to describe the particular unit's/organization's operational definition of Effective Schooling. Resources are listed and described in Appendix D. What follows are the presenters and the major Effective Schooling categories to which the resources described relate:

Presenters	Effective Schooling Categories
Mabel Lee *Jim McGeever* Appalachia Educational Laboratory	- leadership - classroom instruction and management - assessment and evaluation - school environment
Carol Thomas *David Holdzkom* CEMREL, Inc.	- school environment - school improvement - leadership - classroom instruction and management - general RDx synthesis function
Richard McCann Research for Better Schools, Inc.	- leadership - classroom instruction and management - curriculum - school improvement
Bob Ewy Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory	- classroom instruction and management - assessment and evaluation - school improvement - curriculum - effective schooling and rural schools
Jan Johnson Keith *John Westbrook* Southwest Educational Development Laboratory	- assessment and evaluation - classroom climate - synthesis on Effective Schooling
SWRL Research and Development	- classroom instruction and management - assessment and evaluation
Doug Fleming Northeast Regional Exchange	- classroom instruction and management - assessment and evaluation - leadership - school improvement - computer technology - effective schooling and rural schools

Keats Garman *Tom Olson* *Joe Pascarelli* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory	- leadership - classroom instruction and management - school environment - curriculum - assessment and evaluation - computer technology - school board training
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development	- See Appendix D - Selected Resources Relating to Effective Schooling Processes

EXAMINING WHAT REPRESENTED PROJECTS HAVE DEVELOPED/ADAPTED

The second module of Phase I provided participants opportunities to peruse the resource materials described in the earlier module. Participants were encouraged to quietly examine and become familiar with those materials that seemed to be of high interest. At the conclusion of the module, participants indicated those presenters with whom they wanted to interact and learn more from concerning their resources and ways in which they were used. This information was used to structure the subsequent small-group interactive sessions.

INTERACTING: PRESENTERS/PARTICIPANTS EXAMINE RESOURCES ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING

The final module of Phase I consisted of 9 one-hour, small-group interest sessions during which presenters described in a more indepth way the resource materials described earlier (See Appendix D - Selected Resources) and the ways in which the materials are adapted to use on the district/school/classroom level. Participants were encouraged to probe particularly in such areas as how the materials are matched to the needs of clients; what impact the resources appear to be making; and

what kinds of training occurs for the users. The following is a listing of the small-group sessions conducted during this module:

Session	Presenter(s)
DETEK - a teacher evaluation system	*Jan Johnson Keith* Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Resources used in conjunction with Pennsylvania's long-range planning for School Improvement Program	*Ed Patrick* Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Resources developed for use in the Alaska Effective Schooling Program	*Dick Luther* Alaska Department of Education *Bob Blum* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Resources developed for the New Jersey Education Association's School Effectiveness Training Program	*Ron Houston* Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Effective Schooling materials disseminated to the Northeast states	*Doug Fleming* Northeast Exchange
Keys to School Boardsmanship Training Program	*Alan Shark* National School Boards Association *Keats Garman* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Tools for McREL's Effective School Program	*Bob Ewy* Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory
Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School (a Knowledge Synthesis)	*John Westbrook* Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Resource materials (training design instruments, worksheets, readings, documentation) developed for the Hawaii Principal as Instructional Leader Action Research Project	*Joe Pascarelli* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

PIECING TOGETHER THE FRAMEWORK: A SUMMARY

Tom Olson contrasted for the large group the sketchy R&D knowledge base on Effective Schooling during the 60's to the relatively sophisticated base emerging. The earlier emphasis on program adoption appears to be replaced with considerable efforts made to assess and to diagnose contexts and to match and adapt R&D resources to needs.

Some commonalities exist across labs in terms of developing and delivering resources--emphases on areas like classroom management and instruction and school environment, as well as attention to rapid and efficient application of the R&D knowledge bases. Lab units, on the other hand, are using a variety of topical starting points (e.g., school climate) and entry points (e.g., school leadership teams) as they deliver resources to district/school/classroom levels. Consequently, a wide range of delivery strategies are being used (e.g., leadership institutes, occasional papers, school improvement programs).

Some issues that need further study include: refining the Effective Schooling R&D practices for secondary schools; balancing attention to the policy, management, and service domains; and identifying curriculum elements in addition to alignment that need to be researched. These issues were addressed by the panel during Phase III.

STATE, INTERMEDIATE AND LOCAL LEVEL EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING PRACTICES

Representatives from state departments, local urban school districts, and an intermediate unit were invited to share briefly development and implementation activities occurring on those levels. Discussants were:

Phil Whiteman - Indiana State Department of Education

Floyd Keller - Minnesota State Department of Education

Dave Bennett - Milwaukee Public Schools

Olga Moir - Wayne County Intermediate Unit, Michigan

John Grate,
Zulfi Ahmad - Cincinnati Public Schools

Walter Pilditch - Chicago Public Schools

Highlighted were reports of such developmental activities as: inservice teacher training programs using effective teaching strategies aimed at improving student achievement; leadership training for principals and the development of building school improvement plans; and the implementation of information delivery systems focusing on basic skills and effective schooling practices.

THE POLITICS AND ADMINISTERING OF INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS - *Dr. Dale Mann,* Teachers College, Columbia University

Mann asserted that not only does considerable evidence acknowledge that instructionally effective schools exist, but also that they do make a difference with respect to student achievement. Presently completing an NIE-funded project that is based on a delphi analysis of a national panel of experts on instructionally effective schools, he delimited the parameters of the study to the following definitions:

<u>instructionally</u> = a measurable academic achievement

<u>effective</u> = ability to override learning related deficiencies ordinarily associated with low social class standing, background, etc.

<u>schools</u> = variables that are controllable using only the resources that <u>presently</u> exist with the authority that <u>already</u> exists

Setting the stage for a review of these controllable variables, he highlighted the results of two significant studies. Evaluation results of

an urban reading curriculum project sponsored by Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory in collaboration with a commercial publisher indicated a direct relationship between increased student achievement and the amount of time spent teaching a specified curriculum. More importantly, "...the data indicate the concept of the 'educationally disadvantaged' is a creation of manipulable and manipulated conditions readily under the control of schools rather than a condition resulting from immutable genetic and environmental factors that inherently impede schooling."*

The five key dimensions synthesized by Ron Edmonds (1979) and their accompanying research bases were then reviewed. (See Appendix E - Summary of Within School Factors Thought to Characterize the Instructionally Effective School.) "We are in the presence of an increasingly mature science in effective schooling," Mann stated, "and the Research and Development Exchange has the responsibility of giving this set of alternatives to their clients throughout the regions."

The following key points emerged from his review:

1. It's possible to increase student achievement without increased funding--using existing resources.

2. There are important things to be done--now!

3. We cannot hold "another generation hostage" until we acquire additional resources.

4. We've got to translate the leadership factor into operational terms. Political support is necessary. Leaders must be facilitating, assertive, direct, clear. They must be willing to risk the "consensual" underpinnings of schools, if necessary.

5. Direct instruction may mean more work and increased difficulty to implement.

---

*Ralph Hanson and Richard Schultz. "A New Look at Schooling Effects from Programmatic Research and Development." In Dale Mann (Ed.), Making Change Happen? New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

6. The emphasis on instruction, specifically "academic press," clearly relates achievement to time spent teaching.

7. There is a clear need to gather data to measure the instructional effectiveness of schools. For example, careful relationships must be made between a variable like teacher effectiveness and accountability.

8. The more we move toward analyzing the production function of effective schooling, the closer we begin to approach matters of ethics (e.g., the learning pill bottle).

He pointed out, however, that the knowledge base, though not yet aggregated and analyzed for its policy-level implications, is "realistic, positive, and rather direct." There is remarkable unanimity among the studies and the job of the RDx group is to treat it with quality responsibility.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING: WHAT ARE LABS AND CENTERS DEVELOPING? - *Shirley Hord*, The University of Texas

Hord described the nature and function of the Effective Schooling interest group comprised of CEDaR institutions and distributed a listing of names and contact information. The group is collaborating in a series of meetings primarily focused on sharing the variety of resources being developed. Appendix F - Effective Schooling: What Are Labs and Centers Developing? contains both a listing of member agencies and a list of representative resources being developed by some Centers.

ADDITIONAL R&D RESOURCES EMERGING FROM A NATIONAL INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Pascarelli identified and made available to participants a series of papers prepared for a National Invitational Conference - Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice. The conference, sponsored by the

Division of Teaching and Programs of the National Institute of Education, was held primarily to review at least eight years of significant research on teaching and determine its importance for the improvement of instructional practice. Conference participants included researchers, association representatives, authors of the papers, practitioners, and NIE staff who used the twelve commissioned papers as a basis for examining R&D findings and for deriving implications for practitioners. Pascarelli suggested the papers for a similar use by Seminar participants and their respective clients. See Appendix G - Papers Prepared for the National Invitational Conference - Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice for a listing.

PHASE II: ANALYZING EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES - *Dr. Phil Hawkins*, Michigan State Department of Education
Dr. David Clark, Indiana University

SHARING AND ANALYZING HOW WE'RE DELIVERING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT-BASED RESOURCES

Facilitator Phil Hawkins helped participants focus on dissemination processes being used to deliver R&D information/resources on effective schooling. He asked participants to consider the unique features and characteristics of effective dissemination strategies--to move, then, from exploring the what (e.g. effective schooling research) to the how.

Some modification in the agenda enabled Clark to present a brief but comprehensive recap of the literature in the change process and change agents and to identify some implications for seminar participants engaged in adapting R&D resources (e.g. dissemination strategies). Drawing from

Paul's* review of significant conditions for change in educational contexts, Clark pointed out and elaborated on the following factors:

1. Perceived legitimacy is a major influence on effectiveness.

2. Teachers work best with and rely most on fellow teachers in information sharing and collaboration for change.

3. Face-to-face interaction and two-way communication are necessary for successful change.

4. An open organizational climate facilitates the introduction and use of an innovation.

5. Involvement and participation by those affected by a change facilitates adoption.

6. Effective leadership is important but not sufficient.

7. Experience with change programs facilitates subsequent adoptions.

8. A recognized fit of the change program with school needs facilitates the adoption of an innovation.

9. Availability of additional financial resources are useful but not always necessary for effective change to occur.

10. Attention must be given to the nature of the innovation--its advantages, simplicity, compatability with existing practices.

In addition, Clark synthesized some additional critical factors identified by several key dissemination studies (Seashore Louis, Crandall, Emrick, etc.):

1. Schools can and do learn from research--even schools that could be considered less than good risks.

2. Provision of training and technical assistance are critical when it is specific to the innovation, of a helping and supportive nature, and especially consists of a wide repertoire of knowledge and skill transfer.

---

*Douglas A. Paul, "Change Processes at the Elementary, Secondary and Post-Secondary Levels of Education," in N. Nash and J. Culbertson (Eds.), Linking Processes in Educational Improvement. Columbus, Ohio: University Council For Educational Administration, 1977, pp. 7-73.

3. Inconclusive evidence exists as to the level of importance the role of the principal plays in effective schooling practices.

4. The issues of quality and availability of resource materials are paramount in the adoption/adaption of an innovation.

5. The change process is gradual, incremental and cumulative.

6. Less adaptation occurs than was earlier assumed; more adoption occurs.

These were discussed and treated as independent variables that influence effective schooling practices in a similar fashion as Mann's "content" variables.

With this as a common base of understanding, Hawkins formed three discussion groups. During this time period Regional Exchange representatives identified in operational terms the unique features and characteristics of their dissemination strategies. See Appendix A - Guidelines For Presenters, Phase II for issues discussed.

The groups were identified as:

Group A - including RBS, SEDL and NWREL Exchanges/Labs

Group B - including CEMREL, RBS, and McREL

Group C - including NWREL, NERX, and RBS

PHASE III: IDENTIFYING AND ANALYSING KEY ISSUES FACED IN DELIVERING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING RESOURCES TO CLIENTS - *PANEL: Doug Fleming, Richard McCann, Olga Moir, Tom Olson*

Joined by Hawkins and Clark, a panel representing labs and an intermediate unit focused on five key issues that emerged from the exploration of both the R&D knowledge/resource base and the dissemination

strategies in use. They are:

1. The need for members of the R&D community to direct attention to the three organizational domains--policy, management, and service delivery. Balance of emphases and identification of viable strategies across domains are two areas of concern;

2. The need to clarify, modify, and refine the roles and functions of Regional Exchange staff as more effective dissemination techniques are matched to the emerging R&D knowledge base;

3. The need to analyze closely the interaction of variables in the content of effective schooling R&D (e.g., leadership, climate) as they are integrated within school district/building/classroom contexts.

4. The developmental needs that arise as the R&D knowledge base becomes operationalized in concrete activities. For example, what behaviors do effective principals demonstrate as instructional leaders?

Some observations made by Clark and others reaffirmed these issues:

- the need to attend to policy issues having to do with Effective Schooling processes
- collaboration and the willingness to participate in interagency relationships is becoming an issue for effectiveness and, in some cases, survival
- the importance of the role of the facilitator in collaborative relationships
- the need to assume policy leadership as the knowledge base is applied
- the challenge to R&D agencies - isolation? or networking?
- the dynamics of schooling evolves around school people
- delivery systems must be carefully and continually analyzed for impact
- dissemination or delivery strategies have to be constantly tested against such criteria as relevance, effectiveness, suitability, timeliness, etc.
- there is a need to develop an organized national R&D resource base in Effective Schooling processes
- Labs and centers need to increase the disseminating of R&D resources to the local level

- o local levels are assuming increasing responsibilities and we've got to help them refine and rethink their delivery systems
- o the R&D community needs to establish frequent and open communication channels with local levels

CLOSING STATEMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT

Pascarelli asked the group to refocus on the purposes of the Seminar and particularly to refocus on the three phases--profiling R&D resources, analyzing dissemination strategies, and identifying/analyzing key issues faced in delivering R&D resources. Highlights of Mann's and Clark's presentations were reviewed, as well as the variety of dissemination strategies.

Pascarelli pointed out, "We're all leaving this Seminar with new and rich experiences, more notes, matrices, and charts--and finally newer contacts and friends. It doesn't end here. In a sense, it's just the beginning. The challenge at hand is to harness and use these resources and match them to the unique needs of our clients." He thanked participants for their willingness to share and explore , acknowledged the support of those who helped in both planning and implementation, accepted the role of "connecting" them to appropriate resource persons (Appendix C - Resources I Need to Know More About), and adjourned the Seminar.

SECTION II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

DSS SEMINAR ON:

Effective Schooling and Dissemination Processes

October 12-14, 1982

Center for Continuing Education
University of Chicago

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Dr. Zulfi Ahmad
Cincinnati, Public Schools
230 E. 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45211
(513) 369-4090

Dr. David A. Bennett
Milwaukee Public Schools
P. O. Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 475-8004

Dr. Bob Blum
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-6800, Ext. 442

Mr. Clark Chipman
U.S. Department of Education
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 353-1743

Dr. David Clark
Indiana University
Education 248
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 335-0185

Mr. John Coulson
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 202081100
(202) 254-5654

Dr. Harriet Doss-Willis
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139
(314) 781-2900

Mr. Bob Ewy
McREL
2600 S. Parker Road
Bldg. 5, Suite 353
Aurora, CO 80014
(303) 337-0990

Mr. Douglas F. Fleming
Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc.
101 Mill Road
Chelmsford, MA 01824
(617) 256-3987

Mr. Keats Garman
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-6800, Ext. 542

Ms. Ruth Gordon
Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 486-3655

Dr. John H. Grate
Cincinnati Public Schools
230 E. 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 369-4870

Ms. Nina Gupta
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 476-6861, Ext. 213

Dr. Rex Hagans
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 295-0204

Ms. Daryl Hahn
Maine State Department of Education
State House Complex, Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-2139

Dr. Phil Hawkins
Michigan State Department of Education
520 Michigan National Tower
Lansing, MI 48933
(517) 373-3324

Ms. Pat Helbig
Office of Equal Educational Opportunity
Chicago Public Schools
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 641-4347

Mr. David Holdzkom
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139
(314) 781-2900, Ext. 216

Dr. Shirley Hord
Research & Development Center for Teacher Education
Education Annex 3 203
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712
(512) 471-1343

Mr. Ronald Houston
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

Ms. Jan Johnson-Keith
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 476-6861

Dr. Diane Kell
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 492-7100

Mr. Floyd Keller
Department of Education
550 Cedar Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-4060

Dr. Bill Larkin
Milwaukee Public Schools
P. O. Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 475-8043

Dr. Mabel C. Lee
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
1031 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25064
(304) 347-0415

Mr. Robert W. Long
Milwaukee Public Schools
P. O. Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, WI 53215
(414) 475-8012

Mr. Dick Luther
Alaska State Department of Education
State Office Building, Pouch F
Juneau, AK 99811
(907) 465-2830

Dr. Dale Mann
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
(212) 678-3727

Dr. Richard A. McCann
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

Mr. James M. McGeever
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
(304) 347-0427

Ms. Linda McNeely
LINK
1847 N. Chautauqua Street
Wichita, KS 67214
(316) 685-0271

Ms. Olga Moir
Wayne County Intermediate S.A.
33500 Van Horn Road
Wayne, MI 48184
(313) 326-9300, Ext. 307

Mr. Max Morrison
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-5274

Mr. Tom Olson
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 295-0209

Dr. Joe Pascarelli
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 295-0216

Mr. Edward Patrick
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9033

Mr. Walter Pilditch
Office of Equal Educational Opportunity
Chicago Public Schools
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 641-4347

Mr. Paul T. Rankin
Detroit Public Schools
10100 Grand River
Detroit, MI 48204
(313) 931-2930

Ms. Jane Roberts
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

Mr. Alan Shark
National School Boards Association
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 337-7666

Dr. Ethel Simon-McWilliams
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 295-0211

Ms. Carol Thomas
CEMREL, Inc.
3120 59th Street
St. Louis, MO 63139
(314) 781-2900

Ms. Judith A. Thomas
Cincinnati Public Schools
230 E. 9th Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 369-4919

Mr. Joseph Vuono
New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street, CN500
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 292-4450

Mr. John D. Westbrook
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 E. 7th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 476-6861

Dr. Phil Whiteman
Indiana State Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 232-6610

Mr. John Wilson
Science Education Center
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
(319) 353-4922

SECTION III

SEMINAR EVALUATION

33

SEMINAR EVALUATION REPORT

For the following 13 items, participants were given directions as follows:

> Please respond to each questionnaire item by circling a number on the scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD). Please respond to all items. Space is provided for you to make any comments you wish pertinent to your response to each item.

On a scale of one to five, "one" being the most positive response and "five" being the lease positive, scores ranged from 1.8 to 3.29.

1982 NATIONAL SEMINAR ON DISSEMINATION PROCESSES

Theme: Effective Schooling and Related Dissemination Processes

Continuing Education Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

October 12-14, 1982

EVALUATION FORM

Directions: Please respond to each questionnaire item by circling a number on the scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD). Please respond to all items. Space is provided for you to make any comments you wish pertinent to your response to each item.

SEMINAR

1.	Pre-Seminar materials distributed to the participants were appropriate and helpful.	SA 1	2	3	4	SD 5
	Comments: _____					
2.	Registration procedures were satisfactory.	SA 1	2	3	4	SD 5
	Comments: _____					
3.	Facility arrangements at the Continuing Education Center were adequate.	SA 1	2	3	4	SD 5
	Comments: _____					
4.	The Seminar activities, as specified in the agenda, were consistent with specified Seminar outcomes.	SA 1	2	3	4	SD 5
	Comments: _____					

		SA				SD
5.	The purpose of the Seminar was clearly understood.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:_____

_____

		SA				SD
6.	The following large group presentations were clear, well-organized and relevant:					
	a. Presentation: The Politics and Administering of Instructionally Effective Schools (Dale Mann)	1	2	3	4	5
	b. Presentation: Effective Schooling: What Are Labs and Centers Developing? (Shirley Hord)	1	2	3	4	5
	c. Presentation: Reflections on Delivery Systems (Dave Clark)	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:_____

_____

_____

		SA				SD
7.	As a whole, the laboratory and center sharing presentations were clear, well-organized and relevant:	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:_____

_____

		SA				SD
8.	Panel presentations were appropriate, clear, focused and provocative:	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:_____

_____

		SA				SD
9.	Work done by Phase III work groups was productive.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments:_____

_____

		SA				SD
10.	Outcomes of Phase III work groups contributed to increased understanding.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

_____

		SA				SD
11.	Resource materials contributed to the success of the Seminar.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

_____

		SA				SD
12.	The Seminar was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

_____

		SA				SD
13.	The design of the Seminar provided for a variety of grouping arrangements.	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

_____

ADDITIONAL

Please indicate your reaction to each of the following statements by checking "yes" or "no."

14. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I have a better understanding of the resources and issues related to practices and strategies for Effective Schooling.

_____ Yes _____ No Comments:

15. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I will be able to make more extensive use of laboratory and center developed strategies for Effective Schooling.

_____ Yes _____ No Comments:

16. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I have increased knowledge regarding dissemination strategies for Effective Schooling.

_____ Yes _____ No Comments:

Please complete the following statements:

17. What I liked best about the Seminar was. . .

18. Things I would change in the Seminar are. . .

19. My overall evaluation of the Seminar on a scale of 1-5, with "1" being low and "5" being high, would be:

1 2 3 4 5

General comments:

	SCALE	SA 1	2	3	4	SD 5	N	Average Rating
1.	Pre-seminar materials distributed to the participants were appropriate and helpful.	5	9	2	1	1	18	2.1
2.	Registration procedures were satisfactory.	8	5	3	1		17	1.8
3.	Facility arrangements at the Continuing Education Center were adequate.	5	6	5	2		18	2.2
4.	The Seminar activities, as specified in the agenda, were consistent with specified Seminar outcomes.	5	9	2	1	1	18	2.1
5.	The purpose of the Seminar was clearly understood.	4	8	1	3	1	17	2.2
6.	The following large group presentations were clear, well-organized and relevant:							
	a. Presentation: The Politics and Administering of Instructionally Effective Schools	13	4			1	18	1.7
	b. Presentation: Effective Schooling: What Are Labs and Centers Developing?	1	2	8	3	3	17	3.29
	c. Presentation: Reflections on Delivery Systems	11	4	1			16	1.43
7.	As a whole, the laboratory and center sharing presentations were clear, well-organized and relevant.	5	9	3		1	18	1.94
8.	Panel presentations were appropriate, clear, focused and provocative.	5	8	1		1	15	1.93
9.	Work done by Phase III work groups was productive.	1	5	1	2	1	10	2.7
10.	Outcomes of Phase III work groups contributed to increased understanding.	2	4	2	1	1	10	2.5
11.	Resource materials contributed to the success of the Seminar.	6	9			1	16	1.8
12.	The Seminar was well organized.	3	7	3	1	2	16	2.5
13.	The design of the Seminar provided for a variety of grouping arrangements.	8	4	4		1	17	1.94

ADDITIONAL	YES	NO	TOTAL
14. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I have a better understanding of the resources and issues related to practices and strategies for Effective Schooling.	17	1	18
15. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I will be able to make more extensive use of laboratory and center developed strategies for Effective Schooling.	14	1	15
16. As a result of participating in this Seminar, I have increased knowledge regarding dissemination strategies for Effective Schooling.	13	3	16

17. What I liked best about the Seminar was...
(See summary of respondents' comments following.)

18. Things I would change in the Seminar are...
(See summary of respondents' comments following.)

19. My overall evaluation of the Seminar on a scale of 1-5, with "1" being low and "5" being high.

		Low				High
N	Average	1	2	3	4	5
17	3.70	1	2	1	10	3

17. The two items the participants mentioned most often with regard to what they "liked best" about the Seminar were the presentations by Dale Mann and David Clark and the opportunities to interact and exchange information about Effective Schooling R&D and dissemination strategies.

18. Under the "things I would change" statement, most of the comments regarded a different sequence of presentors; smaller panels; more "field" and "active researcher" presentations, but with more group interaction and perhaps a narrower audience (e.g. role-alike).

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTERS AND LISTENERS

GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTERS

Phase I: Profiling Effective Schooling Resources

Time Block
Tues. 2:00-3:45

- Your primary role is to describe for the group how your project/agency is defining or treating the area of Effective Schooling and the kinds of resources that are being adapted/developed. Five very broad categories will be displayed on a large Effective Schooling matrix and also be included in the Seminar work packet. They (the five categories) will serve primarily as place holders for listeners as you describe your perspective. The general categories are as follows:

  Leadership
  School Environment
  Curriculum
  Classroom Instruction and Management
  Assessment and Evaluation

  There will also be provision for new categories as they most certainly emerge. (See attached Effective Schooling Matrix.)

- You should not be influenced by the identification of these five categories as a presenter. It is the listener's responsibility to relate your information to an appropriate category(ies) on his/her personal matrix. In this manner (by 10:00 Wednesday) the listener will comprehend how it is that each of our projects is treating Effective Schooling.

- Think of this presentation as a brief awareness, then, of your view of Effective Schooling and also as a means to identify the resources you've developed and brought along for display and discussion.

- It is our expectation that your materials will be displayed at another end of the room for listeners to peruse during the next time block.

- Please try to emphasize your operational definition of Effective Schooling and the resources adapted/developed. De-emphasize, if possible, your dissemination strategies since they'll be described during Phase II.

- Each of our projects is at a unique stage and level of development and is emphasizing various aspects of Effective Schooling based on our region's needs. As a result, bring along the variety of materials you're using--planning tools, position papers, instruments, training designs, etc. . . . the richer the variety, the better!

GUIDELINES FOR LISTENERS

Phase I: Profiling Effective Schooling Resources

Time Block
Tues. 2:00-3:45

As you listen to the presenters describe how their projects/agencies define or treat the area of Effective Schooling and the kind of resources they are adapting and developing, please use the Elements of Effective Schooling Matrix below and relate the information being presented to the appropriate category(ies) in the Matrix.

Some questions that may assist you in this process are:

- What are the specific items being presented under each category you hear being presented?
- Is there a particular position or point of view being taken?
- What are some of the assumptions being made?
- Is there a particular focus or emphasis being used?

Please use this Matrix as a listening tool during Phase I. At 10 AM on Wednesday, we want you to share the results of your observations and contribute to a composite view of how the projects/agencies presenting are treating Effective Schooling.

GUIDELINES FOR LISTENERS

Phase II: Analyzing Effective Dissemination Strategies

Time Block
Wed. 11:30-4:30

As you listen to the presenters describe their dissemination strategies used in delivering resources on Effective Schooling, determine the extent to which they are focusing in on the following questions:

- What are the unique features and characteristics of the dissemination strategies being described?
- What are the assumptions being made about these strategies?
- What conditions are required both in the organization presenting and in the client groups to whom services are being delivered?
- What are the limits and constraints of the strategies being used?
- What resistances are overcome in implementing these strategies?
- How are relationships sustained over time?
- What direct and concrete benefits do clients receive?
- What levels does the presenting unit focus on? -- statewide? systemwide? schoolwide? individual classrooms? combinations?
- What kinds of start-up and entry strategies are used? In what ways does the client indicate need for help? How is the help given matched with the need expressed?
- Have the strategies been evolving? If so, how have the changes occurred? Where is the unit headed?
- What indicators of success are emerging that point to the effectiveness of the dissemination strategies?

APPENDIX B

ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING MATRIX

ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING MATRIX

Leadership	Classroom Instruction and Management	School Environment
Curriculum	Assessment and Evaluation	Other
Other	Other	Other

APPENDIX C

RESOURCES I NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT

RESOURCES I NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT

Items	Contact Person/Organization

50

Items	Contact Person/Organization

APPENDIX D

SELECTED RESOURCES RELATING TO EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING PROCESSES

- Appalachia Educational Laboratory
- CEMREL, Inc.
- Research for Better Schools, Inc.
- Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
- SWRL Research and Development
- Northeast Regional Exchange
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
- Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Lee, Mabel. School Effectiveness: Climate, Goals and Leadership, 1982.

A proceedings document summarizing a regional two-day conference. It contains practical techniques a school district can use to implement positive school climate strategies and, in addition, it identifies and illustrates curriculum alignment processes.

McGeever, James. Ohio Households' Opinions of Education Report, 1979.

This publication reports the results of a statewide public opinion survey. Respondents indicated their levels of trust and confidence in public schooling, their knowledge about and interest in public education, and the kinds of information they were interested in acquiring. Recommendations for action are included for the Department of Education and other agencies.

Meehan, Merrill. Evaluation of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Demonstration Project in Putnam County, West Virginia, 1981.

This study occurred to evaluate the implementation of the Stallings Classroom Management Project in two secondary schools in Putnam County. The purpose of the program is to increase student achievement in basic skills through the utilization of research based, systematic change in teachers' behaviors, especially as those teaching behaviors relate to the managment of classroom instruction time and the organization of classroom activities. Evaluation of objectives, methods, product/process results, and recommendations for the refinement of the implementation are included.

Ryan, Thomas. Techniques for Reducing Truancy and Disruptive Behaviors in Schools, 1980.

This product describes techniques used to identify effective programs

and then describes a variety of national programs that have effectively reduced truancy and disruptive behaviors.

Sullivan, Debra; Basile, Joseph; and Higginbotham, Kenneth R. Implementation of the Stallings Classroom Management Staff Development Demonstration Project in Putnam County, West Virginia, 1981.

This detailed account of a staff development project is an outgrowth of the teacher effects research and research-based effective teaching practices model developed by Stallings (Teaching and Learning Institute). It is an example of integrating and testing relevant school- and classroom-based R&D through the collaborative efforts of a laboratory, a state department of education, a state county office, and a consulting institute.

CEMREL, INC.

Bebermeyer, Ruth. Leadership for School Climate Improvement, 1982.

One of the most comprehensive reviews of school climate processes, this publication is organized with an Introduction and three general sections: (1) Leadership--what it is and how we recognize effective leadership for school improvement, (2) School Climate--what it is and how we recognize desirable school climate, and (3) Improvement--processes for improving school climate, including descriptions of assessment instruments and models for leadership training currently in use. A bibliography and brief summary section concludes that portion of the paper. Sections which follow include (1) Descriptions of Some School Climate Improvement Projects Currently Occurring in the Urban Education Network and (2) Staff Development materials based on the information contained in the paper.

Urban Education Network.

The network is a mechanism for idea-and-information exchanging for high priority concerns of urban districts. One such area identified is effective schooling practices (e.g., leadership for school climate improvement). Network activities typically include reviewing pertinent research literature and existing practices as a basis for planning improvement efforts in the following participating urban districts:

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Schools
Special School Districts of St. Louis County
St. Louis Public Schools
School District of Kansas, Missouri

Illinois State Board of Education
Chicago Public Schools

Indiana Department of Public Instruction
Indiannapolis Public Schools

Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines Public Schools

Wichita Public Schools

Kentucky Department of Education
Jefferson County Public Schools

Michigan Department of Education
Detroit Public Schools

Minnesota Department of Education
Minneapolis Public Schools
St. Paul Public Schools

Nebraska Department of Education
Omaha Public Schools

Tennessee Department of Education
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools
Memphis City Schools

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Milwaukee Public Schools

Ohio Department of Education
Akron Board of Education
Cincinnati Public Schools
Columbus Public Schools
Cleveland Public Schools
Toledo Public Schools

Anderson, L. W. Teachers, Teaching, and Educational Effectiveness, 1982.

This paper, presented at national Title I seminars, summarizes what we mean when we say teachers are effective. It then provides four generalizations of what teachers do as effective managers of learners and eight generalizations of what teachers do as effective managers of learning. It concludes with a discussion of why we are not doing what we know.

Brookover, W. B. Effective Secondary Schools, 1981.

This paper, after a brief review of what we mean by "effective schools" and of recent research, presents a frame of reference for examination of effective schools. The frame is organization around (1) the ideology of effective schools, (2) social structure of effective schools, and (3) instructional practices in effective schools.

D'Amico, J. J. The Effective Schools Movement: Studies, Issues and Approaches, 1981.

This paper is a critical review of three studies of effective schools: Edmonds and Fredericksen, Brookover and Lazotte, and Duckett et al. Specifically, the review explore (1) the match between specific findings and conclusions, (2) the reliability of conclusions and of the operationalization of them for policy, (3) the relevance of the conclusions for urban secondary schools, and (4) the capacity of the operationalizations to be used by practitioners. The paper then recommends practical ways of eliminating ambiguities in the research. It concludes by discussing four key elements for school improvement: (1) expectations and standards, (2) parent participation, (3) orderly, disciplined, safe environment, and (4) small teacher/student ratios or small classes.

Epstein, J. L. A Discussion: Secondary School Environments and Student Outcomes, 1981.

This paper reviews research on secondary school environments, discussing the conceptual diversity of that research, highlighting some recent efforts to link characteristics of school environments to student outcomes, and suggesting some ways of extending both concepts. The paper then briefly turns to two themes in the literature on adolescents in school: boredom and participation. It concludes with a discussion of themes found in recent studies of the high school regarding how those schools are in trouble and what needs to be done to make them more effective.

Huitt, W. G. and Segars, J. K. Characteristics of Effective Classrooms, 1980.

This paper discusses four characteristics of effective classrooms: (1) teachers design and implement instruction in relation to specific student characteristics such as prior learning and learning styles; (2) teachers teach the knowledge and skills measured by tests used to assess student progress; (3) students engage in learning activities for an appropriate amount of time each day; and (4) students experience a moderate to high level of success in their learning activities. The paper concludes with a discussion of some integrative models of instruction (e.g., Cooley, Leinhardt, and Lohnes, direct instruction model, mastery learning model), and a possible framework for local action.

Roberts, J. M. E. and Smith, S. C. Instructional Improvement: A System-wide Approach, 1982.

This paper, prepared for the Maryland State Department of Education, is a synthesis of research relevant to instructional improvement from four perspectives: the classroom, the schools, the local education agency, and the state education agency. The paper reviews research on curriculum alignment, attention to student characteristics, use of instructional time,

success rate, and quality of instruction. It considers research on the role of the school environment, its organization for effective instruction and the role of the principal. It discusses LEA data-based planning and decision-making procedures and the roles of central office staff in instructional improvement. It finally addresses state education agency roles in designing programs and providing support to local instructional improvement efforts.

Squires, D. A. Characteristics of Effective Schools: The Importance of School Processes, 1980.

The paper reviews research of characteristics of effective schools. The review considers input-outcome relationships and process-outcome relationships suggested by recent research. It presents an analysis of the Rutter et al. study. It concludes with a summary which organizes the research findings into three sets: indicators of effectiveness--school and classroom levels, social processes operating in effective schools (modeling, providing feedback, developing consensus), and beliefs.

Squires, D. A.: Huitt, W. G.; and Segars, J. K. "Improving Classrooms and Schools: What's Important." Educational Leadership, 1981.

This article, which will be the introduction of an ASCD monograph to be published in 1983, presents a research-based framework to guide classroom and school improvement efforts. The framework is organized around dimensions of an effective classroom (student achievement, student behaviors, teacher behaviors, classroom supervisions), and around dimensions of school-wide norms and leadership.

RBS has been and is continuing to work in support of seven statewide school improvement programs:

1. Delaware's School Improvement Program--with particular emphasis on:
   - o Delaware's school standards and monitoring process

- o Department of Public Instruction's brochures for standards on school climate and classroom management
- o Department of Public Instruction's inservice program for school staffs

2. Maryland's Project Basic--with particular emphasis on:
   - o generation of student competencies
   - o design of statewide implementation plan
   - o role of Project Basic facilitators
   - o design of community-based learning laboratory
3. Maryland's School Improvement Through Instructional Process (SITIP) Program--with particular emphasis on:
   - o selection of instructional improvement practices
   - o presentation of RBS basic skills instructional improvement program
   - o role and effectiveness of MSDE technical assistors
   - o impact of program on local practice
4. New Jersey's Comprehensive Basic Skills Review (CBSR) Process--both design and implementation.
5. New Jersey Education Association School Effectiveness Training (SET) Program--both design and implementation.
6. Pennsylvania's Long-Range Planning for School Improvement (LRPSI)--with particular emphasis on:
   - o long-range planning process and associated resource materials
   - o technical assistance structure and its development
7. Pennsylvania's Instructional Improvement Mission--with emphasis on its design.

Following is a list of program-related resources and a list of reports describing the programs and their effects:

Resources

- o Information on services and resources available from RBS' Basic Skills Instructional Improvement Program.

Reports

- o Corbett, H. D. After Implementation: Principals' Contributions to Maintaining Change, 1982.
- o Corbett, H. D. School Context and the Continuation of Innovative Practices, 1982.

- Corbett, H. D. School Organizational Coupling and the Implementation of Planned Change, 1981.

- Corbett, H. D. "To Make An Omelette, You Have to Break the Egg Crate: Teacher Interdependence Promotes School-Side Change." Educational Leadership, 1982.

- Dawson, J. A. Support for Educational Change: Its Forms, Functions, and Sources, 1980.

- Dawson, J. A. Teacher Participation in Educational Innovation: Some Insights Into Its Nature, 1980.

- Firestone, W. A. and Corbett, H. D. Rationality and Cooperation in External Assistance for School Improvement, 1979.

MID-CONTINENT REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Noteworthy: School Improvement, Summer, 1981.

This issue of Noteworthy focuses on school improvement. The resources included are drawn from recent research into what makes schools effective and what it is that schools do to produce high student achievement. Materials are grouped into three sections:

-- Classroom Management and Instruction
-- Building Management and Instructional Support
-- Management of Curriculum and Evaluation

Those authors whose works were abstracted and reviewed for this edition include Beatrice Ward, Carolyn Evertson, Jean Medick, Michael Rutter and Ron Edmunds.

School Improvement Workshops.

This series of inservice workshops are designed to help schools use research findings in effective schooling to develop a building-specific improvement program.

SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

DETEK (The Development Teacher Evaluation Kit)

SEDL is offering short training workshops to introduce this innovative system for developing teacher evaluation. Designed for use by school principals and supervisors with individual teachers, the system provides for ongoing, objective, systematic teacher evaluation. Data gathering instruments are used to depict teacher classroom performance, to diagnose teacher accomplishment and needs, and to formulate a growth plan.

Proceedings from the Invitational Roundtable for Urban Superintendents: What the Chief Executive Needs to Know About School Effectiveness, early 1983.

This product summarizes a two-day conference that communicated to policy-level state educators the results of significant R&D-based findings on effective schooling. Presenters included Jane Stallings, Gene Hall, Wilbur Brookover and superintendents from Atlanta, Milwaukee and Santa Clara County.

Westbrook, John. Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School?

Used as part of the pre-seminar packet distributed to registrants, this knowledge synthesis product presents a fresh conceptual approach to viewing and dealing with R&D findings in effective schooling. More specifically, the paper considers four general types of literature related to school effectiveness: case studies (descriptions of effective schools), outlier or comparative studies (comparisons of effective and ineffective schools), program evaluation (examination of effectiveness-oriented programs) and reviews of school effectiveness literature. The paper synthesizes the more consistent findings of studies which have used objective measurement processes to analyze the characteristics of effective schools.

SWRL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Curriculum Alignment, 1981.

This booklet describes a collaborative project with the Los Angeles Unified School District which was operationalized in 81 schools. Anchored in school effectiveness R&D findings, the project focuses on the matching of classroom instruction with continuum-based goals and assessment procedures. The Curriculum Alignment Project is implemented in schools through onsite staff development sessions conducted by principals and school coordinators. They are responsible for describing the project, organizing and leading staff development, and communicating school concerns to appropriate project/district staff.

NORTHEAST REGIONAL EXCHANGE

Effective Schools: A Positive Force in the Northeast, 1982.

In response to the chief state school officers, Northeast Exchange conducted a regional "sweep" to gather timely information and to share findings with member states in the area of Effective Schooling practices. The first section of the document outlines what is currently the state-of-the-art in school effectiveness programs. The second section provides selections from various sources. The final section describes additional programs, annotates significant resources and lists comprehensive references. Since the process used to gather information was cursory and designed essentially to glean only the essentials, the search was called a "sweep."

Effective Schooling in a Rural Context: A New Hampshire View, 1981.

Commissioned by the Department of Education for local districts and other agencies, this collection of papers on Effective Schooling is

focused on the rural setting. Contributors include professors of education and state department of education consultants. Strong elements of management and organizational development principles are reflected in the papers.

The Connecticut School Effectiveness Sampler, 1981.

This product describes processes and materials resulting from the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project. Included in the sampler are:

-- descriptions of a process model to help building principals and faculties examine certain characteristics coincident with student learning

-- demonstrations of how an action plan that is based on sound change theory is used to implement concepts

-- descriptions of assessment instruments and processes

NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Design Conference Papers (Alaska Effective Schooling Project).

As part of project development activities, a series of papers were commissioned to address significant R&D factors contributing to Effective Schooling practices. The papers were presented at a design conference whose outcome goals included the development of a leadership training program for school district personnel and the development of a statewide system to research, report and evaluate the implementation of effective school practices. The papers are identified as follows:

Davies, Don. "Citizen Participation and School Effectiveness."

Duke, Dan. "Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness."

Hall, Gene. "Changing Programs from a Concerns-Based Perspective."

Lipham, James. "Leadership of the Principal for Educational Improvement."

Carnine, Doug. "Components of the Direct Instruction Model."

Cohen, S. Alan. "Mastery Learning: What Is It? How Do We Get It? How Do We Know We Have It?"

Evertson, Carolyn. "What Research Tells Us About Managing Classroom Instruction Effectively."

Behr, George. "Test-Wiseness: Using Test Information for Planning Instruction."

Brookover, Wilbur. "Effective Schools." and "Effective Schools/Outline."

Effective Schooling Practices, 1982.

This booklet represents a synthesis of the school effectiveness and teacher effectiveness research bases and a conceptual framework that integrates them into five major elements:

-- Leadership
-- School Environment
-- Curriculum
-- Classroom Instruction and Management
-- Assessment and Evaluation

Effective Schooling Practices: A Report Presented to the Honorable Jay S. Hammond, Governor of Alaska. (Governor's Task Force on Effective Schooling), 1981.

This report addresses the responsibilities of schools, recent trends in schooling, educational goals and conditions and practices necessary for effective schooling. Research-based practices are highlighted and specific recommendations developed by the State Task Force regarding the formal specification of responsibilities of schools, revision of the elementary school course of study, revision of high school graduation requirements, and adoption of statements of effective schooling practice. Minimum responsibilities of schools are grouped in three differing categories: primary, shared and supportive.

Keys to School Boardsmanship: A Program of Continuing Education for School Board Members, 1982.

Developed and pilot tested by NWREL project staff, a total of 13

training units in the form of inservice programs are available for local school boards. The programs, available in workshop formats, address the following topics:

- -- reaffirming the school board's responsibility to attend to the improvement of instruction
- -- identifying effective school board behaviors
- -- clarifying expectations through goals and objectives
- -- reviewing elements of effective schooling validated by recent research
- -- implementing improvement of instruction through the policy development process
- -- school improvement as the focus of collective bargaining

These materials are now solely distributed by the National School Boards Association, which is prepared to assist state organizations to plan, organize and implement board development programs. The programs are:

- o School Board Self-Assessment--A procedure for board members and the superintendent to review board operations and identify areas for improvement.
- o Conflict: Alternatives to Blowing a Fuse--A workshop focusing on the causes of conflict, and strategies for managing it.
- o Teamwork: The Board and Superintendent in Action--A workshop centered around a film narrated by Dr. Jack Ramsay, and featuring board superintendent relations.
- o Policy Development--A workshop and film about the board's roles and key decisions in the policy development process.
- o Program Evaluation: School Board Roles--A workshop devoted to identifying board actions and decisions based upon systematic evaluation of school.
- o Board/Administrator Relations--A workshop based upon several critical elements in an effective relationship between the board and superintendent.
- o Effective School Board Meetings--A workshop which examines effective meeting practices and procedures.
- o Policy is Power--A workshop focusing on the "how to" of policy development.
- o Communicating With the Community--A workshop for examining board roles and responsibilities in effective communications with the public.

- What Do School Boards Do?--A workshop in basic boardsmanship for candidates and new board members.

Especially related to the effective schooling R&D base are the following three programs:

- School Improvement: A Control Function of School Boards--A fresh view of the boards role in the learning process.
- Building Bridges: School Board Political Roles--Political roles of board members at local, state and national levels.
- The Education Management Team--The whys, whats and how to's.

The Leadership Guide (Alaska Effective Schooling Program), 1982.

Trainer Manual: Training One, Two, 1982.

These instructional tools are part of a multiphased training program for school level leadership teams. The Leadership Guide may be viewed as a handbook/workbook resource useful in the implementation of effective schooling projects. The Manuals, companion pieces, contain training specifications for implementing the training program built around the Leadership Guide.

The Principal as Instructional Leader: An Action Research Project (Documentation)

Detailed documentation of a two-year professional development program custom-designed for a group of elementary and secondary principals representing the District of Hawaii. The program has emphasized the careful matching of relevant R&D findings and resources to building-specific problems. Professional and personal growth has been plotted by participants on three levels: the self, the group (the team of principals) and their respective schools. Included in the documentation reports are training designs, agendas, worksheets, handouts, readings and reports of onsite (school building) applications of learnings.

Research Synthesis Reports

A series of reviews of research literature has been developed which address school effectiveness practices. The reports are based on a tested knowledge synthesis model that includes formal search, analyses and syntheses procedures and result in conclusions and recommendations that focus on school-based implementation. Selected reviews directly addressing effective schooling practices are:

Cotton, Kathleen and W. G. Savard. Class Size, 1980 (ED 214 705).

_____. Direct Instruction, 1982 (ED 214 909).

_____. Student Discipline and Motivation, 1982.

_____. Instructional Grouping: Ability Grouping, 1981 (ED 214 704).

_____. Instructional Grouping: Group Size, 1981 (ED 214 703)

_____. Intermediate Level Mathematics and Science Instruction, 1982.

_____. Mastery Learning, 1982.

_____. Parent Involvement in Instruction, K-12, 1982.

_____. Parent Participation, 1980 (ED 214 701).

_____. The Principal as Instructional Leader, 1980 (ED 214 702).

_____. Time Factors in Learning, 1981 (ED 214 706).

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Although the following resources were not presented at the Seminar, this documenter would be remiss in not calling attention to the following products:

Bossert, Stephen; Dwyer, David; Rowan, Brian; and Lee, Ginny. The Instructional Managerial Role of the Principal, 1982.

This product illustrates a conceptual model of how one can examine the role of the principal and determine the extent to which he/she demonstrates an instructional managerial role.

Dwyer, David; Lee, Ginny; Rowan, Brian; and Bossert, Stephen. The Principal's Role in Instructional Management: Five Participant Observational Studies of Principals in Action, 1982.

As a result of some shadowing studies of effective principals, a research team describes behavioral dimensions of successful instructional management.

Mergendoller, John; Mitman, Alexis; and Ward, Beatrice. The Junior High School - Middle School Program Validation Study, 1982.

Ward, Beatrice and Tikunoff, William. Lessons From the Junior High School Transition Study: How Can We Restructure Schools to Make Them More Successful for All Students, 1982.

These two products are the results of action research studies of junior high - middle schools. Summaries of findings of the studies include transitions to secondary schools.

Additional Materials (Handouts):

Tikunoff, William. "Instructional Features That are Related to Successful Student Performance," 1982.

Bossert, Stephen. "Current Research and Its Practical Implications for the Instructional Manager," 1982.

Ward, Beatrice. "Some Essential Features of School Improvement," 1982.

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF WITHIN SCHOOL FACTORS THOUGHT TO CHARACTERIZE THE INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOL*

*Excerpt from D. Mann and J. Lawrence (Eds.)

"Instructionally Effective Schools"
Impact on Instructional Improvement, 1981

TABLE I. SUMMARY OF WITHIN SCHOOL FACTORS THOUGHT TO CHARACTERIZE THE INSTRUCTIONALLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

	EDMONDS	CLARK LOTTO McCARTHY	VENEZKY WINFIELD	MADDEN LAWSON SWEAT	BROOKOVER LEZOTTE	AUSTIN	MADAUS ET AL
	(20 Detroit and 5 Lansing Schools: achievement data plus case analysis)	(Secondary analysis of 117 urban education studies plus elite interviews)	(Reading progress of two urban, minority schools, one high, one low achieving)	(Controlled for class. 21 high achieving/low achieving schools)	(6 improving, 3 declining Michigan schools)	(Secondary analysis of 4 SDE studies of "exceptional" schools)	(Re-examination of school effectiveness studies)
(A) Principals' characteristics and behavior	Strong leadership	High expectations	High expectations of reading achievement; high task orientation; works closely with specialists; high risk reading goals.	Directive about decisions, but "supportive" of teachers.	Assertive leader, responsible for evaluation of accomplishment of objectives. High expectations of kids.	Strong leadership, observes & teaches high program control, more experience & "pertinent" education. High expectations of all.	High expectations; high structure; clear goals.
(B) Teachers' characteristics and behavior	High expectations of childrens' minimum performance.	Staff development programs with specific goals.	Confident, inventive, flexible; encourage students, maintain discipline; high staff development; low time on administrative work.	"Task oriented."	High expectations for all kids of beginning and of further academic achievement. Feel responsible for teaching. "Accountable." Less satisfied.	More experience, more "pertinent" education. "Warmer high expectations of kids.	High expectations of students; provide structured classrooms, emphasize homework.
(C) School climate or atmosphere	Orderly, conducive to learning, quiet.	Structured learning environment.	High morale; effective use of praise; focus on student achievement.		"Disciplined."		Student discipline & structured learning stressed. "Traditional values" of teaching and learning.
(D) Instructional emphasis	Highest priority to pupil acquisition of basic skills.	Concentration on teaching clear goals.	Highest priority to reading with clear goals; homogeneous groupings for reading; client centered services, adaptable instruction.	More time to social studies. More whole group instruction.	Emphasis on reading and math. More time invested.	Emphasis on cognitive development. Longer instructional day.	"Strong press for academic excellence." Emphasis on homework and study.
(E) Pupil Evaluation	Frequent.	"Individualized Instruction."	Closely monitored student progress.	Yes.	Teachers accept pupil test results as measure of their adult performance.	Teacher-made tests.	Tests closely related to syllabus. Test taking skills stressed
(F) Resources	Flexible allocation to follow priorities.	Small classes, more adults. Outside, extra money.	Availability and coordination of extra personnel, time and materials; supplementary materials.	Many adult volunteers, fewer paid aides, high access to additional materials.	Not high use of paraprofessionals.	"Close involvement" of teachers and paraprofessionals with pupils.	"Shared purposefulness" among school persons and home.

D. Mann & J. Lawrence (Eds.) Instructionally Effective Schools. Impact on Instructional Improvement, 1981, 16 (4), pp. 8-9.

APPENDIX F

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING:
WHAT ARE LABS AND CENTERS DEVELOPING?

AND

SOME REPRESENTATIVE RESOURCES
DEVELOPED BY SOME
CENTERS

Shirley M. Hord
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
Austin

NATIONAL R&D CENTERS AND REGIONAL LABORATORIES

	Director's Name
Appalachia Educational Laboratory P.O. Box 1348 Charleston, West Virginia 25325	Terry L. Eidell Director
CEMREL, Inc. 3120 59th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63139	Lawrence D. Fish Acting President
Center for Educational Policy & Management College of Education University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon 97403	Robert H. Mattson Director and Associate Dean
Center for Social Organization of Schools The Johns Hopkins University 3505 North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland 21218	Edward McDill and James McPartland Co-Directors
Center for the Study of Evaluation UCLA Graduate School of Education 145 Moore Hall Los Angeles, California 90024	Eva L. Baker Director
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development 1855 Folsom Street San Francisco, California 94103	John K. Hemphill Laboratory Director
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation 600 North River Street Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	David P. Weikart President
Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Government CERAS Building School of Education Stanford University Stanford, California 94305	Henry M. Levin Director
Learning Research and Development Center University of Pittsburgh 3939 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260	Lauren Resnick and Robert Glaser Co-Directors
Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratory 4709 Belleview Avenue Kansas City, Missouri 64112	Lochran C. Nixon, Jr. Executive Director

National Center for Research in Vocational Education Ohio State University 1960 Kenny Road Columbus, Ohio 43210	Robert E. Taylor Executive Director
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory 300 S.W. Sixth Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204	Robert R. Rath Executive Director
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education Education Annex, Room 3.203 The University of Texas at Austin Austin, Texas 78712-1288	Oliver H. Bown Director
Research for Better Schools 444 North Third Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123	John E. Hopkins Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory 211 East Seventh Street Austin, Texas 78701	Preston C. Kronkosky Executive Director
SWRL Educational Research and Development 4665 Lampson Avenue Los Alamitos, California 90720	Richard E. Shutz Executive Director
The NETWORK 290 South Main Street Andover, Massachusetts 01810	David P. Crandall Executive Director
Wisconsin Center for Education Research University of Wisconsin--Madison 1025 West Johnson Street Madison, Wisconsin 53706	Marshall S. Smith Director

SOME REPRESENTATIVE RESOURCES DEVELOPED BY SOME CENTERS

Resource	Agency
Studies on the Principalship by Shirley M. Hord	Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin (RDCTE)
Implications of Research: Preparing Principals for Leadership Roles, by S. M. Hord and J. C. Thurber, 1982.	RDCTE
Describing the Concerns Principals Have About Facilitating Change, by W. L. Rutherford, G. E. Hall and B. W. Newlove, 1982.	RDCTE
What Does the Principal Do to Facilitate Change: Their Interventions, by S. M. Hord and M. L. Goldstein, 1982.	RDCTE
Effects of Principal Interventions on Teachers During the Change Process, by L. L. Huling, G. E. Hall and S. M. Hord, 1982.	RDCTE
Three Change Facilitator Styles: Some Indicators and a Proposed Framework, by G. E. Hall, W. L. Rutherford and T. H. Griffin, 1982.	RDCTE
The Classroom Management Improvement Study: An Experiment in Elementary School Classrooms, by E. Emmer, J. Sanford, C. Evertson, B. Clements and J. Martin, 1981.	RDCTE
Organizing and Managing the Elementary School Classroom, by C. Evertson, E. Emmer, B. Clements, J. Sanford & M. Worsham, 1981.	RDCTE
The Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education: Concepts and Practices, by Herbert J. Klausmeier, 1980.	Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, Madison, Wisconsin

RESOURCE	AGENCY
The Measurement of School Climate: A Practical Guide for School Administrators, by Gary D. Gottfredson, Deborah K. Ogawa, Donald E. Rickert, Jr., and Denise C. Gottfredson, 1982.	Center for Social Organization of Schools (CSOS), The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
Program Development Evaluation, A Structure for Researcher-Practitioner Collaboration in School Improvement, by Gary D. Gottfredson, 1982	CSOS, The Johns Hopkins University
School Action Effectiveness Study Student Questionnaire	Conducted by CSOS, The Johns Hopkins University
Towards A School-Level Conceptualization of Instructional Management: The Principal's Role, by Steven T. Bossert, David C. Dwyer, Brian Rowan and Ginny V. Lee, 1982.	Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
Methodological Considerations in Studies of Effective Principals, by Brian Rowan, David C. Dwyer and Steven T. Bossert, 1982.	Far West Laboratory
Linking Educational Policy and Management With Student Achievement, by Kenneth Duckworth, 1981.	Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM), University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
Administrative and Supervisory Support Functions for the Implementation of Effective Educational Programs for Low Income Students, by Russell Gersten and Douglas Carnine, 1981.	CEPM
The Principal's Role: How Do We Reconcile Expectations with Reality?, by Wynn De Bevoise, 1982.	CEPM
Collegiality May Be the Password to Effective Inservice Programs, by Wynn De Bevoise, 1982.	CEPM
Programs for Research at the Center for Educational Policy and Management, by Robert H. Mattson and Kenneth E. Duckworth, 1982.	CEPM

RESOURCE	AGENCY
The Management of Education Professionals in Instructionally Effective Schools: Toward a Research Agenda, by CEPM Educational Professions Committee: Richard H. Hersh, Douglas Carnine, Meredith Gall, Jean Stockard, Mary Ann Carmack and Paul Gannon, 1981.	CEPM
Time in the Classroom: The Effect of Collective Bargaining on the Allocation of Teacher Time, by Randall W. Eberts and Lawrence C. Pierce, 1982.	CEPM

APPENDIX G

PAPERS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE - RESEARCH ON TEACHING: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE*

*These papers will be reproduced by the ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service early in 1983.

RESEARCH ON TEACHING PAPERS

Brophy, Jere. Classroom Organization and Management, 1982.

Edmonds, Ronald. Programs of School Improvement: An Overview, 1982.

Fullan, Michael. Implementing Educational Change: Progress at Last, 1982.

Green, Judith and Smith, Deborah. Teaching and Learning: A Linguistic Perspective, 1982.

Griffin, Gary A. Staff Development, 1982.

Hamilton, Stephen. The Social Side of Schooling: Ecological Studies of Classrooms and Schools, 1982.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Smith, Marshall S. Effective Schools - A Review, 1982.

Rosenshine, Barak. Teaching Functions in Instructional Programs, 1982.

Schlechty, Phillip and Vance, Victor. Recruitment, Selection, and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force, 1982.

Shavelson, Richard. Review of Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Judgments, Plans, and Decisions, 1982.

Ward, Beatrice and Tikunoff, William. Collaborative Research, 1982.

Weinstein, Rhona. Student Perceptions of Schooling, 1982.